

Very few people in this country have seen their income cut as dramatically as the average family farm income has been cut over the years. This loss of income, then, is somewhat ironic. We are dropping food into Afghanistan because people are on the abyss of starvation; we hear reports of old women climbing trees in Sudan to forage for leaves to eat; and one-half a billion people go to bed every night with an ache in their belly because it hurts to be hungry. All told, thousands of children die every day from hunger and hunger-related causes. Yet the farmers of South Dakota and North Dakota and Kansas and Montana and Nebraska are told, when they load their truck with wheat or barley and take it to the country elevator, that which they produce has no value. They are told the food somehow has no value, that the price is collapsed because it is not worth very much. It seems to me that much of the world is placing great worth on that which we produce in great abundance on America's farms.

If we can't find a way to connect that which we produce to those who need it, then we are not thinking hard. The surest road to stability and peace in the world is to try to help people who are hungry. We must place a value on the food our family farmers produce. Again, there is a disconnection there somewhere. We need to find it and reconnect it.

Let me again say, I hope in the coming couple of weeks we will, in the Senate, make it a priority to write a farm bill, bring it to the floor, and go to conference with the House. We have that obligation to our family farmers. That ought to be our responsibility now. It is not only good for family farmers; it is good for American security interests, for food security interests to do that. I hope we will do it soon.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AVIATION SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1447.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, let me correct a statement I made sometime last week when we were checking into the practice of other countries with respect to airport security. We were told that of the countries in Europe, all were Government employed.

That should be corrected. That is not the case. In fact, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and England, those four countries, have contracts, but they have the health benefits and the guaranteed vacation and other benefits guaranteed by the Government. It is a sort of hybrid situation.

Of 102 countries around the world with significant air travel systems, only 23 use contract screeners. I think that is not the point I want to make this afternoon.

No one would suggest that we take the security for the President of the United States; namely, the Secret Service, and privatize it, contract it out. Nor would anyone recommend privatizing the security that the distinguished Chair, myself, and other Senators receive, the Capitol Police, who incidentally have been working around the clock, doing an outstanding job. You can go on down the list, whether it is Customs, whether it is the Border Patrol, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service that has some 33,000 personnel, no one in the House or Senate has suggested that we contract that out.

No one has suggested we contract out the Federal Bureau of Investigation with the thousands of professionals conducting the investigation right now. No one suggests that they take some 669,000 civilian workers in national defense and contract them out. In fact, there was a suggestion by the OMB earlier this year to do just that. The OMB folks called over to the Pentagon and said: We are looking at downsizing and we want to get some contracting out of 5 to 10 percent of your civilian workers. And the Department of Defense said: That will never happen. We are in the security business.

Yet the big hangup is federalization, the Government taking over the responsibility of security for air travel in America.

Now, we have tried after Pan Am 103 back in 1988, with more training, more hours, more supervision, extra this and extra that, to no avail; we had TWA 800 in 1996 and again the Gore commission with more training, more supervision, and what have you. And now we have 6,000 killed and 13,000 casualties. To me, it will take unmitigated gall, with the recent experiences in mind, to come forth with a contracting out proposal.

Only a while ago did I learn why we are having to put up with this nonsense. All you have to do is read Roll Call, "Airport Firms Form Alliance." The airport firms formed an alliance with a Swedish company and call themselves the Aviation Security Association. And who do they have as members? The contractors that want to keep continuing their misdeeds. For instance, one of the association members, Argenbright had the contract for the Dulles and Newark airports.

Now, let's read about Argenbright. I find in an article on September 13 in the Miami Herald:

The security company that provides the checkpoint workers at the airports breached by Tuesday's hijackers has been cited at least twice for security lapses.

In its worst infraction, Atlanta-based Argenbright Security pleaded guilty last year to allowing untrained employees, some with criminal backgrounds, to operate checkpoints at Philadelphia National Airport.

In settling the charges, Argenbright agreed to pay \$1.2 million in fines and investigative costs.

... Argenbright was also found to have committed dozens of violations of Federal labor laws against its employees at Los Angeles International Airport, an administrative law judge ruled in February 2000.

Here we are trying to do the work of the people of America, and we don't have any Senators listening. They are listening to the lobbyists, the K Street crowd, who are down here working the different Senators, and I can't explain to them the problem of security at the airports. Mind you me, those who are falsifying records, if you please, are now saying what we have to do is have contracting out; we can't federalize.

Of course, that appeals to the crowd that comes into public service by promising to get rid of the Government. "The Government is not the solution, the Government is the problem." That is all they all talk about. They are thinking of what? Of next year's reelection. They are not thinking of security. They are thinking: Wait a minute now, I was going to downsize and get rid of the Government, and now I supported 18,000 screeners and some 10,000 other airport personnel—some 28,000 I am going to put on the Government payroll, and my opponent is going to say: He promised to get rid of the Government, and he went and voted to add 28,000 more Government jobs.

That is the problem—along with the blooming lobbyists. They are trying to carry out their political commitments. They are not looking out for the safety of the traveling public in America. The worst thing we have ever done is give the money to the airlines. They didn't take care of the employees. I had Herb Kelleher, of Southwest Airlines, tell me he did not furlough a single employee and maintained 100 percent service. But they were all going broke. Why? Because the lobbyists took over—the same crowd that came running around hollering they were all going to go broke. Here I am fighting to do the people's work, and Senators are gathered together in their offices with all of these airline lobbyists. This is the fifth week since September 11, and we can't pass airline security.

All of America wants this responsibility fixed within the Government. No one for a second, as I say, would suggest that the FBI and the Secret Service, the Border Patrol, and Customs, or

any of the other security agencies—no one would suggest that the 669,000 civilians in defense be contracted out. According to the lobbyists the Government is too big, the Government can't do anything. They ought to be ashamed of themselves. Look at what is happening. Turn on your TV if you want to see what Government can do. Look at these attacks on Osama bin Laden and the Taliban. I don't know—there are some 31 different military targets, with 2 countries involved, B-2s coming all the way from Missouri, ships stationed in the Indian Ocean, planes coming off Diego Garcia—all Government, Government recruited, Government fed, Government housed, Government trained, Government deployed, with precision work that we all praise—but we can't get a Government airport security screener. Oh, no, no, that would be against my ideology. No, we want contracting out, privatization.

We now know what we are putting up with in this lobbyist crowd and the silly ideology that the Government can't do anything. Well, I am proud of our Government; I am proud of our deployment. We are going to correct this situation, and we are not going to have an Executive order. I have heard word that the administration might implement an Executive order to take care of it and say Congress is dragging its feet.

We are trying to go along and be bipartisan and everything else because this is a bipartisan bill, reported unanimously out of the Commerce Committee. We have been ready to vote and take amendments, consider them and vote upon them. But they are going to say now that we are going to have to get an Executive order because we are dragging our feet and can't get security out of the Congress, mind you me.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DORGAN. I was listening with interest to the Senator about this issue of national objectives and Federal employees doing airport screening. I know there are some who think there is nothing in Government that can be done correctly. But I say them, that they should go to ground zero in New York City, the site of these terrorist acts, and talk to the firefighters and law enforcement people. They will then understand that those Government employees, those firefighters who lost their lives, were climbing the stairs of those twin Trade Towers even as they were coming down. As that fire broke out in both buildings and people began to evacuate those buildings, those firefighters were going up with full backpacks. People told me—and I read reports—of seeing firefighters on the 20th floor and the 30th floor, nearly out of breath, climbing the stairs of those buildings. Those are public servants

providing a public service that is unmeasurable in its value to this country.

So when I hear people talk about Government workers in a disparaging way, I say this: There are a lot of people who commit themselves to public service in this country who, every day and every way, every hour, protect this country and stand up for the interests of this country. Yes, I'm describing the firefighters of New York, and the law enforcement folks in New York and New Jersey and the surrounding region, but this public service also occurs in every community across this country, every single day.

The Senator from South Carolina has proposed, and I support, the notion that at the 100 largest airports in this country we federalize the screeners who are screening baggage so that they are following national standards and national training guidelines. It makes great sense to me. And with respect to the other airports, I believe the Senator proposed that local airports could contract with law enforcement officials and others to do the same thing.

But it seems to me that—I guess I will ask the Senator this question, finally, that we are hung up on this issue at this moment: The issue of aviation security is of paramount importance to this country. Why? Because some people don't like the notion that we would replace the big companies that have now contracted to provide this service—service where inspector after inspector has shown us you can drive a truck through the holes in the service. They decide: We don't want to do it. Therefore, we will hold up the legislation and not allow it to continue.

How long, I ask the Senator, have we been held up on the floor of the Senate by this ideology that says we won't allow there to be Federal screeners at the Nation's largest airports? How long?

Mr. HOLLINGS. We are into the fifth week. We are into the fifth week since the attacks. We immediately held these hearings, and I called the distinguished Secretary of Transportation the week of this occurrence. It was on the following Thursday immediately after September 11th. I said: I am going to set this hearing up. I said: You can enhance cockpit security by installing reinforced cockpit doors. We found in Israel that once you secure that cockpit—and Boeing said they could retrofit doors immediately in the next 2 to 3 weeks, and then they will have a more secure door. They have a retrofit package for the planes right now, and if you and I were head of an airline, we would immediately require this for the security of our pilots.

We want pilots to fly, not fight. Once they secure that door, then you do not have disturbed individuals storming that door as we had on that Los Angeles to Chicago flight. That ends hijack-

ing for all intents and purposes, because never again can they use an air flight as a weapon of mass destruction.

I do not want to pass up the eloquence of the observation of the Senator with respect to these firefighters. They are the best in the world. They are not paid enough. They are working extra hours, and they were willing, as the Senator says, to give their life to try to save those lives while the building was coming down. They thought there could be a chance they would save a life or two, and they were going up those steps. That is fixed in my mind.

We should be ashamed of ourselves for delaying this bill. We get all boiled up about procedure. We have to move now. Once we moved 97 to 0 to cloture, we need to go ahead to the bill itself. Why are we not debating the bill this afternoon and passing it tonight?

There are two or three amendments. Let us vote on those amendments. They could be just ideas. We are not hard and fast, except on one thing, and that is to get airport security. Yes, there is flexibility in the bill. We live in the real world.

Take small, rural airports such as at Bamberg and Orangeburg, SC. They are not used to having the federalization of the system, but we have to have the Federal standards for inspections to make certain they have airport security. We do not want a plane coming from, say, Bamberg to fly into Charlotte and then the passengers get off, never having been checked properly, to come into Washington, never having had the proper security check.

So that is a lesson I learned from El Al, the Israeli security agents, and the chief pilot at El Al. He told me, for example, once that cockpit door was closed, they could be assaulting his wife in the cabin, but he does not open the door. That is why, when they heard this Russian plane that had come out of Israel exploded and went down into the Black Sea last weekend, they knew immediately it was not from a bomb, because for 30 years they have known they are not going to get anywhere. They are still investigating the possibility that a Ukrainian missile gone astray may have caused the crash. They might start a fight and hurt, say, 5 people, but not 5,000. But the pilot immediately lands and already has law enforcement waiting to take over.

The rule used to be—and I guess still is unless that FAA is getting going—if I am the pilot and you come forward and say, this is a hijacking and I want to go to Havana, Cuba, you say, oh, yes, I always wanted to go to Cuba; let's all go to Havana, wonderful, yes—just go wherever the hijacker wants and get it down and then let law enforcement come.

No, the rule has changed and ought to have been changed 3 weeks ago, and



they are still dillying around wondering about contractors and the employees.

I actually had a meeting with the transportation officials, and they were talking about 9 months to a year to get this thing done. Absolutely ludicrous. We are in an emergency situation. We have men committed in battle, putting their lives on the line, and we are talking about maybe securing our airlines in a year's time even though we have already sent \$15 billion to the airlines.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. I do not mean to interrupt the Senator, but I was inspired listening to his discussion and I want to make a couple of additional comments, concluding with a question.

It is not unusual for politicians to compliment themselves, but the Senator from South Carolina is not someone who would ever do that. So let me pay a compliment to Senator HOLLINGS and also to Senator MCCAIN. The Senator has brought a bill to this Chamber that makes good sense. He worked on this legislation in a manner of developing a consensus, worked in a bipartisan way, brought a bill in a very timely manner, and then, as the Senator from South Carolina has said, it has been hung up now for some weeks.

It is inexplicable that in a time of national emergency—and it is that, not just with respect to national security issues but also with respect to this economy—it is inexplicable that there is, among some, business as usual in the Senate. This is not business as usual. In my judgment, it ought to be a circumstance where, if someone disagrees with what Senator HOLLINGS and Senator MCCAIN have brought to the floor, then by all means offer an amendment, make their best case and try to strip it out.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Right.

Mr. DORGAN. Have a record vote and strip it out.

As I understand the circumstances, those with whom the Senator disagrees at this point, they are content just preventing the Senator from considering this bill because they do not want to have a vote. They will lose the vote, and lose the vote by a fairly large margin.

Will the Senator from South Carolina agree with that assessment?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I agree with that assessment, and part of that assessment should go right to the lobbyists. This is actually a headline: Airport firms form alliance. Well, they did not form an alliance for safety or security. They formed an alliance to feather their own nests. They are not interested in security, and that is what the hold-up is over with that political stand-off of "get rid of the Government." They are thinking about their reelection campaigns next year. They are not think-

ing about the security of airline travel in America, I can say that.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield one final time for a question? I deeply appreciate his indulgence.

The reason this is important, aside from basic safety, which I think is paramount, is the airline industry and commercial aviation are critically important to this country's economy. Prior to September 11 our economy was very soft, and the airline industry as a leading economic indicator was hemorrhaging in red ink going into September 11. Then the Government shut down the entire commercial aviation sector, just shut it down completely. Now that it has begun to start up once again, people are leery, are worrying about whether or not they want to get back on an airplane. People are cancelling trips. They are cancelling conferences.

The thing is, Government has the obligation to say to those people who have images in their head of an airplane crashing into a trade tower over and over again, we have a responsibility to say to people we are taking effective, decisive, and immediate action to deal with security on commercial airliners in this country, and that is why there is this urgency.

Yes, it is about this industry, but even more so it is about this economy. It is important that we do this, that we do it right, and that we do it immediately.

Let me again say I think the leadership of the Senator and the leadership of Senator MCCAIN is something all of us should cherish, and I hope we can get to this bill and get it moving, have the votes, and pass this legislation. I support what the Senator is doing.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator. It is proper to mention the leadership of Senator MCCAIN, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON of Texas, Senator CONRAD BURNS of Montana, Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE of Maine, and it has been bipartisan; this was not a partisan approach.

We have tried over the past 15 years to set professional standards for airline security, more hours of training, more supervision. But even with all of the contract standards, with all the training, with all the supervision, they are falsifying the records and putting people with criminal records in as the screeners, and they say: Let us keep doing it. Give us some more standards. Give us some more training. Come on.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. REID. I recognize the Senator is not talking about contracting out, but the Senator mentioned contracting out, and I am an opponent of contracting out. I have seen what it has done to Federal installations in the State of Nevada where these outside contractors come in and say, we will

give you a real good deal, and they give a contract this year, and the next year it goes up and up and up, where we would have been better off sticking with Government in the first place.

So I thank the Senator from South Carolina very much for bringing to the attention of the American public the fact we have to federalize the safety of these airplanes and to also alert the American public that contracting out is not a panacea for good government.

Mr. HOLLINGS. That is right. We want those in charge of security to have their minds set on just that, not the bottom line, not the profit. We are going to do the oversight. We will look and see whether there is any fat, or anything else of that kind. The truth of the matter is, we have to have accountability. The only way to do it now is to fix it. Don't have some security measures over here, some over there, and then not check in there.

If you go to the onion ring security structure of the Israel Security Agency and El Al, the Israeli airline, you can see exactly you can't have any gaps. They start with the outer perimeter of intelligence. Incidentally, Senator, when I mention intelligence, harken the New York Times article by Bobby Inman, Admiral Inman, former head of the CIA, which recounts how our intelligence went down, down, down, was inadequate, and brought about—indirectly, obviously—these September 11 attacks. It never could have occurred if we had the intelligence agents like before.

I became involved in intelligence matters under the Hoover Commission in 1954. We had McCarthy running around about security. So President Eisenhower appointed the commission on the reorganization of the executive branch under former President Herbert Hoover. I served as one of the six members of that task force going into the CIA, Army, Navy, air intelligence, security, Secret Service, special clearance, atomic energy. At that time we had the entire sphere of security and intelligence. Under Alan Dulles we had a real outfit, but it has gone down, down, down with respect to high, high costs of technology. And the technology is so amazing to you and me that we can see this and recognize that. We collect as much intelligence information as they have in the Library of Congress, perhaps, every day. But nobody looks at it, they just say: Oh, look at all the information we are getting.

In addition to that, when they are talking about analysts, we want something to look at, but we don't want too much analysis. They have General Schwarzkopf on TV. All weekend he was on the TV. I will never forget the briefing he gave us when he returned from Desert Storm. He told a Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that CIA analysts rounded the edges, they cut

the corners, they protected their backsides. When I got it—I am going to use the word he used—it was “mush.” He said it was of no value, it was mush. I had to go to my pilots in order to get the intelligence and find out how I could move forward.

Now that is what we have been limping along with. It is our fault. There is no question about it. But read what Bobby Inman said. The intelligence is starting at the outer perimeter of a security system. The intelligence is keyed on not just the screener, but when they get to the departure gate, to the pilots, to the marshals on that plane and everything else. And it is not a one-way feed. It is back and forth, all the time. You know somebody is not going to come through with a knife or a gun. The entire airport is a screening place now.

All we do, the Senator and I, we get our ticket to go down to Miami. The agent says here is your ticket; you have seat 9A. So I call my friend who has been out there for 2 years working on the tarmac. He knows when I call, that is the signal. I will take the 12 o'clock flight, 9A, to Miami. He is out there and he goes to seat 9A and tapes a pistol or tapes a box cutter or whatever else they are using. Or you don't have to wait, just go to the counter and you get your seat assignment. Then you just drift around in the crowd. You have already alerted your friend on the tarmac and you are by the window and give the signal, 9A, and he puts a weapon under the seat.

You have to check and have absolute security, not just for screeners but with the person who vacuums the plane. You have the marshals. They come in and they check those things. They don't take their seat and wait for a hijacking, just sitting there eating and drinking. They are alert and know exactly what they are looking for. They look for suspicious actions and reactions on the plane by any of the passengers. They know what to look for. We have to get serious about security because it comes right down to the aircraft.

As I pointed out, once you secure that door, that for all intents and purposes ends the hijacking of commercial flights. But since they have been flying planes, I don't know how we control private flight.

There are many more opportunities for terrorism beyond airlines. But once we secure airlines, we can try to get some of the other things done on the railroads, on the seaports, that the Senator from Florida and his senior colleague, Senator GRAHAM, have been pointing out for years. In fact, we have the bill on the calendar, seaport security. They can take one of those containers which is hardly looked at, bring it into New Jersey, and drive it down to Times Square and have the container full of anthrax, 40,000 pounds.

There can be all kinds of acts of terrorism. This thing is not the 100-yard dash. It is the endurance contest. We have to endure, sober up and get serious. We need to cut out all of our reelection concerns about what we promised to do in getting rid of the Government and that kind of thing. We are elected by the people to make the Government work, and work efficiently and economically.

By the way, this is paid for, Senator. That is the genius of this. All you have to do is put \$2.50 or \$3 and we are arguing that backwards and forwards, but we will get the amount, and that will take care of all the screeners, make sure every bag has gone through the screener. If I go through now and take a bag—they just put out the rule I cannot take but one—but a bag goes through the screener. Why let baggage that goes into the cargo be different? All of the cargo should be screened, air marshals on all of these flights, particularly cross-country and down to Florida, up and down the seaboard, up and down California, and across the country. We have to have those marshals on the plane. Once they know that, America comes back again.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. The Senator has been a great inspiration to me and all the members of the Commerce Committee which he chairs. What a great inspiration it is to see on matters of grave national importance that the Senator, as chairman, and the ranking member, Senator MCCAIN, work so closely together. I want the Senator to know that observation comes from many Members.

What troubles me is that certain Members of this Chamber, for either ideological reasons or for partisan reasons or for parochial reasons, would not recognize what the chairman of the Commerce Committee and the leadership is saying, how important to the national defense of this country it is to produce legislation on airline security so that the American people believe we are following through on a promise we made to them so they will be encouraged to get back on the airlines and start flying. This will help all of the collateral industries such as car rental companies, such as hotels, such as restaurants, tourism destinations, and so forth.

As we say in the South, it is just beyond me—

Mr. HOLLINGS. It is beyond this Senator.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. That we would have people hold up this legislation, cause us to have 30 hours of debate not on the bill but just on a motion to proceed to get to the bill. The big hangup is over federalizing the airline passenger screeners.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Right.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Everybody in America wants the most proficient, the most trained, the most expert, and well-paid people doing the adequate and professional and thorough job of screening people when they go through those checkpoints. If that means federalizing, then we ought to be getting about the business of the American public and passing this legislation and moving it.

I want to add a comment and also another compliment to the Senator, our chairman. Over the weekend I visited two ports in Florida. I visited, on Friday, the Port of Pensacola. In the warehouse there, I found a huge load of sacked flour that was going to Tadzhikistan. Fortunately, those 100-pound sacks of flour were red, white, and blue so people would know where it was coming from—the USA.

That is what we need to do if we are going to try to win the hearts and minds of people as we have had such tremendous success doing in North Korea, a Communist dictatorship. The food we have sent in there is in these red, white, and blue sacks so people know where it is coming from—the USA. So I was very gratified to see that.

But when I went to the Port of Pensacola on Friday and the Port of Jacksonville yesterday, Monday, it was to talk about security and to talk about the bill the Senator had passed out of committee on September 14 and the amendment that he intends to add, increasing the amount available, both in grants and in loan guarantees, for the 300 ports that we have in this country in order for them to upgrade security because, if we are looking at vulnerability, where a terrorist might attack, clearly a port—whether it be a cruise ship or whether it be a commercial ship with a precious cargo or whether it be a port colocated with a military facility or, in the case of the Port of Pensacola, where they would be responsible for loading and unloading military equipment—not for the Pensacola Naval Air Station but for Hurlburt Air Force Base, which is the head of the Air Force Special Operations Command—be it any of those particular roles that a port plays, we have to upgrade security there.

I thank our chairman for his leadership. Wouldn't it be nice to get to the port security bill, if we could get through the airline security bill?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Exactly. Exactly. We are bogged down in here and they all seem to be enjoying it. I do not understand.

I understand you have to be considerate. We are not ramming anything. We do not want to, for example, ram this bill through the House. They are going to have their say, and they do have their say. But heavens above, let's move it over to them so they can have their say.



We want to be considerate—and you have been too generous to me. The point is with respect to seaports, 9 out of 10 containers coming in are not even looked at. If Senator NELSON and Senator HOLLINGS wanted to get into the drug business down in Colombia, we would fill up 10 containers full of cocaine and send it in. I can tell you right now, you have 9 of them that would go through and we would have made a fortune. We don't mind one getting caught; that is the name of the game.

What they have been trying to do is brag how fast they could move cargo through. Up there in New Jersey they not only go to the port, then they go to a staging area 25 miles farther. In between the time they go from the port, actual dock to the 25-mile site, some of them, they never see those trucks again. They don't know where they went or whatever happened to them. They just do not show up for the inspections.

The DEA says, no, it is the Customs' fault. Customs say, no, it is the port's fault. The port says, no, it is the Coast Guard's fault. The Coast Guard says you are running the port and you are in charge. But no one is in charge. That is where we have had it with these contractors.

We are not going to give this the run-around. We are going to fix this responsibility once and for all. With the seaports, under the law, the captain of the port is the responsible officer. You cannot just put in one bill and wave a wand and all of a sudden you have security. You have to give them time and money and let them change the culture and get in step. Labor is absolutely concerned about background checks of those working the docks, just as they were in El Al. They had trouble, the El Al security people and the El Al chief pilot said, yes, we had problems too with labor, and we finally got past that and everybody is subject to these background checks and periodic spot checks for security.

When you mention FAA—and that is one of the reasons we put it under a Deputy Secretary of Transportation and not under the FAA—last week I had the distinction of meeting, if you please, with the former chairman, on the House side, of the Transportation Appropriations Committee of FAA. He told me some of the horror stories. For spot checks he had the individual given the pictures and told: We are going to make spot checks down in Florida next week, so you go to these particular airlines and show them the pictures because these are the fellows coming through making the spot checks.

That is how incestuous the FAA has become. That is why the airlines continue to say they want to be able to provide the money.

No, no, they are going to be Federal employees with Federal pay. It is going

to be subject to appropriations. Why? Because we know already, under the Airport and Airways Improvement Act, we owe them \$15 billion because you and I and the Government have been using that \$15 billion to balance the budget, to cut the deficits down and try to get surpluses. We have not given them airport security. We have not given them airport improvements.

So when we look at this, our distinguished colleague and friend, the Senator from the State of Washington, Mrs. MURRAY—she has that committee. She is going to have the oversight. With Senator BYRD, the full committee chairman, along with Senator STEVENS, the ranking member, we are going to have it subject to appropriations.

The gamesmanship is stopped. We have gotten dead serious about this situation. We are going to fix the responsibility and have accountability, accountability, accountability.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be recognized to speak as in morning business, and the time I consume be counted against the 30 hours of postcloture debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON of Florida are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business")

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE WORDS OF GORDON HINCKLEY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, every 6 months the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, referred to as the Mormon Church, has a semiannual conference. Every 6 months, for 3 days, the leaders of the church get together and those people who are members of the church come to Salt Lake City to the relatively new auditorium which holds approximately 22,000 people. It is broadcast and telecast around the world to 11 million members of the church.

The reason I come to the floor today is to read to the Senate a few select paragraphs from a statement that was given by the president of the church, a 92-year-old man by the name of Gordon Hinckley.

I will ask unanimous consent at the appropriate time to have the full statement printed in the RECORD.

His statement started with the words:

I have just been handed a note that says a U.S. missile attack is underway.

Keep in mind that this is being telecast to 11 million members of the church and millions of others who are watching.

He went on to say:

You are all acutely aware of the events of September 11, less than a month ago. Out of that vicious and ugly attack we are plunged into a state of war. It is the first war of the 21st century. The last century has been described as the most war-torn in human history. Now we are off on another dangerous undertaking, the unfolding of which and the end thereof we do not know.

For the first time since we became a nation, the United States has been seriously attacked on its mainland soil. But this was not an attack on the United States alone. It was an attack on men and nations of good will everywhere. It was well-planned, boldly executed, and the results were disastrous. It is estimated that more than 5,000 innocent people died. Among these were many from other nations. It was cruel and cunning, an act of consummate evil.

Skipping a couple of paragraphs, he went on to say:

Now we are at war. Great forces are being mobilized and will continue to be. Political alliances are being forged. We do not know how long this conflict will last. We do not know what it will cost in lives and treasure. We do not know the manner in which it will be carried out. It could impact the work of the Church in various ways.

Skipping again a couple of paragraphs, President Hinckley went on to say:

Those of us who are American citizens stand solidly with the President of our nation. The terrible forces of evil must be confronted and held accountable for their actions. This is not a matter of Christian against Muslim. I am pleased to see that food is being dropped to the hungry people of a target nation. We value our Muslim neighbors across the world and hope that those who live by the tenets of their faith will not suffer. I ask particularly that our own people do not become a party in any way to the persecution of the innocent. Rather, let us be friendly and helpful, protective and supportive. It is the terrorist organizations that must be ferreted out and brought down.

Skipping two paragraphs, he went on to say:

On the Larry King television broadcast the other night I was asked what I think of those who, in the name of their religion, carry out such infamous activities. I replied, "Religion offers no shield for wickedness, for evil, for those kinds of things. The God in whom I believe does not foster this kind of action. He is a God of mercy. He is a God of love. He is God of peace and reassurance, and I look to Him in times such as this as a comfort and a source of strength."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full statement of Gordon B. Hinckley be printed in the RECORD, with the understanding that his statement is one that lays out what most Americans believe: that we are in a time of trouble; that there are things we can do as Americans to respond.